



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/747,909	12/22/2000	Lucy Broyles	4013-00100	4442	
30652 7	590 01/07/2005	EXAMINER			
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.		CARTER, MONICA SMITH			
5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330 PLANO, TX 75024		330	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			3722		

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/747,909	BROYLES, LUCY		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Monica S. Carter	3722		

		Wioffica G. Carter	3722			
The MAILING DATE of this con	munication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence	address		
THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
<u> </u>	ERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		,		
a) The period for reply expiresmon	ths from the mailing o	late of the final rejection.				
event, however, will the statutory period for	event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension				in		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will	not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that wo	uld require furthe	er consideration and/or sea	arch (see NOTE belo	ow);		
(b) they raise the issue of new m	atter (see Note b	pelow);				
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ they present additional claim NOTE:	s without cancel	ing a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected	claims.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome th	e following rejec	tion(s): 35 U.S.C. 112, 2 nd	paragraph.			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim canceling the non-allowable claim		be allowable if submitted	n a separate, timely	filed amendment		
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or application in condition for allowa			considered but doe	s NOT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be raised by the Examiner in the final		cause it is not directed SOI	_ELY to issues whicl	n were newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the propo explanation of how the new or arr						
The status of the claim(s) is (or wi	ll be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: None						
Claim(s) objected to: None.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-20,23 and 24</u>			•			

8	The drawing correction filed on	is a) <u></u>	approved or	b) 🗌	disapproved by the Ex	kaminer
م ٦	Note the attached Information Discl	neura Sta	tement(s)(PT	0-144	19) Paner No(s)	

10. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

MONICAS. CARTER
PRIMARY EXAMINED

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 10. Other: The examiner maintains the previously set forth rejections. Applicant argues that Alspaw et al. fail to disclose the limitations of Claim 17 which recite that only those pages that were previously selected are bound together. Applicant further argues that it is implicit that the pages deemed unsuitable for memorialization of the experience are not selected and remain loose pages which continue to form part of the partially consumed kit. The examiner asserts that such a limitation limiting the insertion of only selected pages has not been set forth in Claim 17. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Regarding claim 20, applicant argues that an inherency rejection may only be used when the recited structure and/or method may only function in the claimed manner. The examiner disagrees with applicant's assertion. The theory of inherency may be used if the prior art fails to discuss the intended use but discloses an element that appears to have the ability to perform in the claimed manner. In this case, the display book of Alspaw includes text and pictures wherein the text would be read to a prereader (e.g., toddler), since the prereader would not be capable of reading the text of the pages to himself/herself.